

1 COX, CASTLE & NICHOLSON LLP ,
 2 STUART I. BLOCK (STATE BAR NO. 160688)
 3 sblock@coxcastle.com
 4 PETER M. MORRISETTE (STATE BAR NO. 209190)
 5 pmorissette@coxcastle.com
 555 California Street, 10th Floor
 San Francisco, California 94104
 Telephone: (415) 392-4200
 Facsimile: (415) 392-4250

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff
 7 PALMTREE ACQUISITION CORPORATION, a Delaware
 corporation f/k/a Catellus Development Corporation

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

9 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10
 11 PALMTREE ACQUISITION CORPORATION, a
 Delaware corporation,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 MICHAEL R. NEELY, an individual; PERRY J.
 15 NEELY, an individual; GARY NEELY, an
 individual; MICHAEL R. NEELY, PERRY J.
 16 NEELY and GARY NEELY dba MIKE'S ONE
 HOUR CLEANERS; CHARLES FREDERICK
 17 HARTZ dba PAUL'S SPARKLE CLEANERS;
 CHARLES F. HARTZ, an individual;
 18 MULTIMATIC CORPORATION, a New Jersey
 corporation; WESTERN STATES DESIGN, a
 19 California corporation; MCCORDUCK
 PROPERTIES LIVERMORE, LLC, a Delaware
 20 limited liability company individually and as the
 successor to JOHN MCCORDUCK, KATHLEEN
 21 MCCORDUCK, PAMELA MCCORDUCK,
 SANDRA MCCORDUCK MARONA, and IMA
 22 FINANCIAL CORPORATION, a California
 corporation; STARK INVESTMENT COMPANY,
 23 a California general partnership; GRUBB & ELLIS
 REALTY INCOME TRUST, LIQUIDATING
 24 TRUST, a California trust; and DOES 1-20,
 inclusive,

25 Defendants.

26 CASE NO.

27
 28 **PLAINTIFF PALMTREE
 ACQUISITION CORPORATION'S
 DISCLOSURES UNDER FEDERAL
 RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 7.1(B)
 AND NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
 CALIFORNIA LOCAL RULE 3-16**

1 Attached to this pleading, as follows, are the disclosures of Plaintiff Palmtree Acquisition
2 Corporation required pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Northern District of
3 California Local Rules:

4 Exhibit 1 – Disclosure required under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 7.1(b); and

5 Exhibit 2 – Disclosure required under Northern District Local Rule 3-16.

6
7
8
9 DATED: June 30, 2008

COX, CASTLE & NICHOLSON LLP

10
11 By: /s/ Stuart Block

12 Stuart I. Block

13 Peter M. Morrisette

14 Attorneys for Defendant

15 PALMTREE ACQUISITION CORPORATION

**Plaintiff Palmtree Acquisition Corporation
Disclosure Required Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 7.1(b)**

ProLogis, a Maryland real estate investment trust and publicly traded company, owns 80% of Palmtree Acquisition Corporation and ProLogis Fraser, L.P., a Delaware limited partnership, owns the other 20%.

**Plaintiff Palmtree Acquisition Corporation
Disclosure required under Northern District Local Rule 3-16**

Entities or individuals that Palmtree Acquisition Corporation is aware of that may have a financial interest in the subject matter of the litigation are:

1. Plaintiff Palmtree Acquisition Corporation and its parent ProLogis, a Maryland real estate investment trust and publicly traded company, and ProLogis Fraser, L.P., a Delaware limited partnership;
2. Defendant Michael R. Neely, an individual and dba Mike's One Hour Cleaners;
3. Defendant Perry J. Neely, an individual and dba Mike's One Hour Cleaners;
4. Defendant Gary Neely, an individual and dba Mike's One Hour Cleaners;
5. Defendant Charles Frederick Hartz an individual and dba Paul's Sparkle Cleaners;
6. Defendant Multimatic Corporation, a New Jersey corporation;
7. Defendant Western States Design, a California Corporation;
8. Defendant McCorduck Properties Livermore, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company as successor to John McCorduck, Kathleen McCorduck, Pamela McCorduck, and Sandra McCorduck Marona and IMA Financial Corporation, a California corporation;
9. Defendant Stark Investment Company, a California general partnership; and
10. Defendant Grubb & Ellis Realty Income Trust Liquidating Trust, a California trust.

All of the individuals or entities listed above may be liable for some of the remediation costs and other damages at issue in the litigation.

Entities or individuals that Palmtree Acquisition Corporation is aware of that may have an interest substantially affected by the subject matter of the litigation are:

1. The Alameda County Zone 7 Water Agency, which asserts that it maintains drinking water wells in the vicinity of the Site identified in the Complaint; and
2. California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region, which has oversight authority over the remediation of contamination at issue in the litigation.